UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2586th MEETING: 12 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2586)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2586th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 12 June 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2586)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2585th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Kam (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka),

Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Mozambique, Seychelles and Viet Nam in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Davane (Mozambique), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): First, Sir, may I express my gratitude to you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate. This gives me the opportunity to offer you my warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. I am certain that the deliberations of the Council will benefit from your vast experience and proven diplomatic skill.

8. I wish also to express our appreciation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, who during the month of May guided the work of the Council in an exemplary manner.

9. The situation in southern Africa gives cause for great anxiety. My Government has observed with dismay the escalation of violence in South Africa over the past few weeks and notes with concern that the use of force has generally increased, not least due to excessive police action. It appeals to those holding responsibility in South Africa to create without delay a political order that will have the support of all South Africans.

10. In this context, the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa by peaceful means remains a prime objective of our policy. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards *apartheid* as racial discrimination and condemns it without qualification.

11. My delegation has asked to speak in the current debate because in 1977 and 1978 the Federal Republic of Germany, as a member of the Security Council , contributed to the formulation of essential parts of resolution 435 (1978) and ever since has been actively engaged in seeking its implementation as a member of the Western contact group.

12. Regrettably, resolution 435 (1978) has not yet been put into effect. Action to implement it is long overdue, and my Government can understand the embitterment of the African States. It shares their disappointment at Namibia still not having gained independence. My Government believes that the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence must be recognized and should be implemented irrespective of any other problem, although we appreciate that there are important problems still unresolved.

13. Our position on the Namibia question has at all times been clear and unequivocal. In the recent past, my Government has reaffirmed its unmistakable position time and again, most recently on 28 May in Bonn, on the occasion of the twenty-second anniversary of the founding of the Organization of African Unity, when Foreign Minister Genscher addressed that topic.

14. We consider resolution 435 (1978) to be the indispensable basis for a settlement of the Namibian question. In our view, it is the only basis on which Namibia can acquire internationally recognized independence. According to that resolution, the constitution of an independent Namibia must be elaborated solely by a constituent assembly convened as a result of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

15. The imminent installation of a so-called interim government and of other institutions is an act undertaken by South Africa unilaterally and in violation of the provisions of resolution 435 (1978). Furthermore, the South African Government is not authorized to delegate its responsibility for the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan to any political party in Namibia.

16. Resolution 435 (1978) makes no provision for any interim government to be installed by South Africa, but rather for the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision of the United Nations. We are faced with a development that further delays those free elections. Resolution 435 (1978) does not envision the holding of a constituent assembly outside the scope of the settlement envisaged by the United Nations. We would therefore have to regard the convening of such a constituent assembly as a step designed to keep the United Nations out of the process leading to a solution. The United Nations has called for a democratic solution which would give all political groups in Namibia a fair opportunity to help shape the political structure of a future independent Namibia.

17. We share the critical view expressed by many delegations over the past few days that the measures now envisaged come very close to constituting a unilateral declaration of independence. This would be to embark upon a road which directly affects the role of the United Nations in the task of resolving the Namibia problem.

18. Hence, South Africa's institutional plans for Namibia have no prospect of being recognized by the Federal Republic of Germany, and are viewed with grave concern by my Government. In view of resolution 435 (1978) and

the Western settlement plan, it regards such unilateral measures for the installation of constitutional organs and for the delegation of governmental authority in Namibia as null and void. This we have made immediately and unmistakably clear, as have the other States members of the contact group.

19. Given that the South African Government too professes to recognize resolution 435 (1978) as the one and only international basis for a settlement of the Namibia question, my Government appeals to the South African Government to honour its obligations ensuing from that resolution without delay and not to compromise the current negotiating process by unilateral action such as the setting up of an interim government.

20. The history of the Namibia plan worked out by the United Nations is a history of demands and appeals addressed to the Government of South Africa. We see the recent development as a grave attempt by South Africa to evade those demands. It shows that in spite of all the verbal expressions of support for resolution 435 (1978) South Africa is not genuinely in favour of the course to be taken to bring about a settlement. In order to come closer to a result, we must convince South Africa that finding a solution in co-operation with the United Nations, in keeping with resolution 435 (1978), will prove in the long term to be in South Africa's own true interest. Not least for that reason, we believe that the work of the contact group has not yet been completed and that the possibilities open to it have not yet been exhausted.

21. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will follow developments in Namibia with unfailing attention. In doing so it will stay in close consultation with the other members of the contact group. Despite all the setbacks it will not tire in its joint efforts with them to achieve the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We are convinced that a peaceful settlement of the Namibia question will also be conducive to regional détente and to a reduction of military presence alien to the area.

22. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Mr. Mochtar Kusumaatmadja. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

23. Mr. KUSUMAATMADJA (Indonesia): Let me first express my sincere appreciation to you, Sir, and to the other members of the Council for having given me the opportunity of participating in the present deliberations on a question of great concern to all of us. In congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency, I wish to assure you of my high regard for your well-known diplomatic skills and experience, qualities which will certainly prove indispensable to our effort to make concrete progress towards Namibian independence.

24. I should like also to pay deserved tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and to the representative of Thailand for the impeccable manner in which the Council's work was guided during the month of May.

25. These meetings of the Council, requested by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and by the Organization of African Unity, have been convened to confront once again the most intractable question of decolonization ever before the international community. It is indeed difficult to convey in words the proportions and extent of the ordeal that the valiant people of Namibia have borne and continue to bear after a century of colonial oppression and exploitation.

26. It is true that in every respect the situation in Namibia epitomizes all the odious features of the classical colonialism which so many of us here in this Chamber have ourselves experienced. However, it is true also that certain factors contributing to and exacerbating Namibia's present colonial bondage represent a unique challenge to our collective sense of justice and morality, for in the case of Namibia there are the added dimensions of institutionalized racism and racial oppression, of illegal plunder of natural resources and of the arrogant flouting of all accepted norms and the will of the international community.

27. Furthermore, the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and human dignity has in the course of the four decades of United Nations involvement in the question become much more than a question of the internationally acknowledged, inalienable right of the Namibian people themselves. Rather, the decolonization of Namibia and its accession to independent and sovereign nationhood has for nearly 20 years been made the legal responsibility of the Organization itself, an unprecedented responsibility and a sacred trust that obligates all Member States.

28. It has been almost two years since the Security Council last met on the question of Namibia. In the intervening period the world has witnessed the continuing brazen attempts of the Pretoria régime to create new obstacles and diversions in order to block Namibian independence. Consequently, not only does the situation in and around Namibia remain critical, but prospects for a peaceful solution have indeed worsened.

29. It appears quite clear to us that South Africa has no intention whatsoever of co-operating in good faith with the United Nations in the implementation of the letter and spirit of the United Nations plan as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). Any lingering illusions in this regard were dispelled in December 1983 when, after determined and laudable efforts, the Secretary-General reported to the Council that all major outstanding issues under resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved and that only South Africa's intransigence stood in the way of Namibian independence [*see S/16237*]. Since then not only has implementation of the plan been deadlocked, but Pretoria has gone even further in its efforts to subvert that plan, to impose an internal settlement on Namibia and to entrench itself more firmly in the Territory.

30. Thus, it is not only appropriate but imperative for the United Nations, and specifically the Council, to reassert its authority and primary responsibility over Na-

mibia and to take urgent measures to ensure that the United Nations plan is immediately and effectively implemented, without any modifications, qualifications or preconditions.

31. We may perhaps ask ourselves: what is it that drives South Africa to maintain its illegal stranglehold on Namibia? What are the factors that enable it to withstand the pressure of world-wide censure and to defy with impunity all Council decisions relevant to Namibia? What can and should be done to overcome the obstacles that have rendered the United Nations plan virtually a dead letter?

32. Clearly, the leitmotiv for the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia is to be found in the inherent nature of the South African régime itself. It is a renegade régime which has as its core the obnoxious system of *apartheid*, a system pronounced by the United Nations a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind. This hateful doctrine has been implanted in Namibia as well, where it further compounds colonialism's repulsive traits of political oppression, economic exploitation and social degradation.

33. Pretoria's ruthless resort to brute force is another factor contributing to the prolonged agony of Namibia's colonial plight. A massive military force of more than 100,000 troops, deployed throughout the Territory, sustains the repressive structure of its illegal occupation. The forced conscription of Namibians into the armed forces of the racist régime and the creation of tribal armies are continuing. Even more disturbing are reports of a large-scale military offensive recently launched by South Africa in northern Namibia and renewed aggression against Angola. These developments show that, notwithstanding protestations to the contrary, Pretoria remains intent on bludgeoning the Namibian people into submission and in using Namibia as a military launching pad for its subversive and aggressive designs on its neighbours, the front-line States. However, South Africa's systematic attempts to discredit and destroy the national liberation movement of Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), by military might and terror tactics, have failed miserably. SWAPO, as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and its military wing, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, continue to provide exemplary leadership to their countrymen, as they have done for the past quarter-century, in their courageous struggle towards final victory.

34. Apart from Namibia's strategic significance to Pretoria's hegemonistic designs on the region of southern Africa, there is also the lure of Namibia's present and potential economic wealth. Racist South Africa, together with foreign economic interests and transnational corporations, has over the years accrued huge profits through the rapacious exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia, in direct violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia[1] as well as of relevant United Nations resolutions. The existence of uranium and other strategic resources brings an additional political dimension to the situation. Thus there can be no doubt that economic greed and narrowly perceived notions of strategic interest are a potent inducement for South Africa and its friends to delay for as long as possible the inevitable liberation of Namibia.

35. Pretoria's persistent attempts to impose an internal settlement in the Territory, in contravention of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), constitute yet another factor of unacceptable delay and diversion in the process leading towards genuine independence for Namibia. Time and again the Security Council has been called upon to denounce the creation of pseudo-political parties and of puppet régimes in Namibia. Nevertheless, just over a month ago the racist régime launched a new scheme to establish yet another interim government with the so-called Multi-Party Conference as its main constitutent element. The Security Council, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries and SWAPO have all condemned this latest ploy and declared it null and void. However, despite its rejection by the entire international community and the total failure of similar attempts in the past, Pretoria is pressing ahead with the formal installation of its newest contrivance in Windhoek on 17 June next.

36. This latest act of wilful obstruction by South Africa not only proves its basic *mala-fide* intent but should also be viewed against the background of South Africa's seeming imperviousness to international pressure. In this context, I cannot but observe that irrespective of its purported aims the policy of so-called constructive engagement has in effect only encouraged Pretoria's intransigence. Instead of persuading South Africa to relent, this policy has, on the contrary, emboldened the racist régime in its stubborn defiance of world censure. Equally, linking extraneous issues, such as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, to Namibian independence has resulted in a new impasse in the implementation of the United Nations plan. Indeed it should by now be clear to all that the distortive recasting of what is essentially a decolonization question into a regional conflict or an issue of East-West contention has also played into Pretoria's hands.

37. After seven long years of mounting exasperation with the non-implementation of the United Nations plan, owing to the unceasing manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime, the international community expects the Security Council to act resolutely and firmly in the immediate implementation of its own unanimously adopted decisions on Namibia. To equivocate will inevitably entail the most dangerous consequences for peace and security in southern Africa and beyond.

38. We therefore hope that the Council's present deliberations and subsequent actions will not digress into a mere repetition of perfunctory declarations and statements of principle. Indeed, out of these meetings should emanate decisions which will, first, provide for the immediate, unconditional and undiluted implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian prob-

lem; secondly, condemn and declare null and void South Africa's latest attempt to impose a *fait accompli* in Namibia through the installation of a so-called interim government in Windhoek; thirdly, reject any linking of Namibian independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues; and, fourthly, ensure that Namibia accedes to genuine independence, with its territorial integrity intact and its economic viability unimpaired.

39. My delegation would also see merit in mandating the Secretary-General to pick up the threads of his earlier efforts and to finalize whatever details are still left unresolved in the framework of implementing resolution 435 (1978). However, the conclusions reached by the Secretary-General in his report dated 6 June [*S/17242*] make it clear that there has been no change in the position of South Africa on linking extraneous issues to Namibia's independence, that it has not given its response with regard to the remaining details on the implementation of the United Nations plan and that the prevailing difficulties have been compounded by the establishment of the so-called interim government. Hence, it is essential that in renewing the Secretary-General's mandate the Security Council should at the same time serve clear notice to South Africa that, if it persists in its reckless obstruction of the implementation of the United Nations plan, the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations can no longer be postponed.

40. The international community has shown enough patience in the face of South Africa's arrogance and intransigence. If flexibility and accommodation are continually met by duplicity and prevarication, it is time for South Africa's friends to realize that only the application of strong and effective enforcement measures can bring South Africa to its senses. We should like to believe—indeed, we fervently hope—that the prospect of a peaceful transition towards Namibian independence is still within our reach. But this can be assured only if South Africa can be compelled to abandon its present course and, for its own sake, finally heed the expressed will of the overwhelming majority of mankind.

41. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Adviser for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh): Mr. President, it is a privilege for me and the other members of my delegation to participate in this important debate, and I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity.

43. I take part in this debate on the basis of the mandate entrusted to me and to several of my colleagues by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April. I also do so to reiterate our firm support for, and solidarity with, the valiant people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle for freedom and national independence. Despite my extreme preoccupation back home, in the aftermath of a catastrophic natural disaster that hit Bangladesh recently and left behind in its trail death and destruction of monstrous proportions, I am here today to espouse a noble cause involving human dignity and humanity at large.

44. May I congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of the Bangladesh delegation, as well as on my own behalf, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. We are confident that under the able and wise guidance of such a distinguished leader of a fellow non-aligned country, the Council's deliberations will achieve concrete and decisive results towards the early independence of Namibia.

45. I should also like to record our deep appreciation to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of Thailand for the admirable manner in which they guided the work of the Council last month.

46. The Security Council, after a period of nearly two years, is meeting again to resume consideration of the situation in Namibia, on the joint initiative of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the Group of African States. The presence here today of a large number of Foreign Ministers from Non-Aligned Countries is a reflection of the paramount importance that the Movement attaches to the question of Namibia. I should like to recall here that the recently concluded Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries comprehensively reviewed the situation in, and relating to, Namibia, and called upon the Council to act in a decisive manner in fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia and to take urgent measures to ensure that the United Nations plan for Namibia is immediately and unconditionally implemented.

47. The United Nations Council for Namibia—the legal Administering Authority of the Territory—of which Bangladesh is an active member, organized an Extraordinary Plenary Meeting at Vienna from 3 to 7 June. The Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at that meeting [*see S/17262, annex*] also laid the groundwork for the successful resolution of the Namibian question. The outcome of the New Delhi and Vienna meetings, therefore, should guide our current deliberations.

48. The current Council debate on Namibia is taking place at a historic moment. The international community, in a matter of months, is to observe the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. This year also marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The people of Namibia are also observing this year the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of SWAPO—their sole authentic representative. The contribution of the United Nations in the field of decolonization is universally recognized and

is demonstrated by the threefold increase in the membership of this great world body since its inception. It is therefore incumbent upon all of us to do everything possible to remove the last vestiges of colonialism in Namibia.

49. It is a tragedy that nearly two decades after the termination of the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, by the United Nations [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*], the racist Pretoria régime continues to maintain its illegal presence in Namibia, through its abhorrent policies of repression, racism and racial discrimination based on *apartheid*. Thousands of Namibians have been murdered, tortured, imprisoned and uprooted from their land for no other reason than their opposition to the abominable practice of *apartheid*—a system which has been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind. The international community, which has the historic mandate to protect the rights of the Namibian people, cannot remain indifferent to the ever-increasing repressive policies of the racist Pretoria régime. In the face of adversity, the heroic Namibian people have shown exemplary courage and determination, and their struggle for freedom and national independence has earned universal respect and support.

50. It is only natural that Bangladesh, which long suffered colonial subjugation and paid such a heavy price for its own independence, should stand firmly by the side of the oppressed peoples throughout the world in their just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. Consistent with its deep and abiding faith in the Charter of the United Nations and its unswerving commitment to the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Bangladesh has repeatedly affirmed the inalienable rights of all peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence. We are fully convinced that the triumph of such a just and legitimate struggle is inevitable.

51. Based on this firm and principled position, Bangladesh has made every possible effort for the advancement of the cause of Namibian independence. It is our firm conviction that the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the United Nations plan for Namibia as endorsed in Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which constitutes the only basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence. Bangladesh has consistently asked for its immediate and unconditional implementation and has rejected the racist régime's persistent attempts to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues. The independence of Namibia is a sacred international responsibility which cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues alien to the United Nations plan.

52. During the current debate the preceding speakers have given a graphic account of how the Pretoria régime continues to flout all cannons of international law and norms of civilized conduct in Namibia. Spurning the clear and expressed will of the international community, the *apartheid* régime has continued to frustrate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Worse still, the régime has been making repeated attempts to promote puppet political institutions through a façade of an election with a view to imposing an internal settlement in Namibia in clear violation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). Bangladesh has condemned and rejected the latest attempt by the Pretoria régime to impose a neo-colonial settlement in Namibia through the so-called Multi-Party Conference and install a puppet administration in Namibia on 17 June. It is reassuring to note that the international community, in one voice, has rejected this attempt and declared it illegal and null and void. The *apartheid* régime has also made persistent efforts to destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia and has perpetrated a systematic fragmentation of the Territory along ethnic and racial lines on the basis of a so-called homelands policy. We have denounced and rejected these attempts and have repeatedly declared that Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands are integral parts of Namibia and that the territorial integrity of Namibia must be preserved.

53. Similarly Bangladesh has denounced the continued plundering and indiscriminate exploitation of Namibian uranium and other resources by the racist régime in violation of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly and Security Council and in particular Decree No. 1, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.[1] Bangladesh reiterates the call, as contained in the Decree, to all States to take legislative action to prevent the exploitation, processing, transport and marketing of Namibian resources.

54. With a view to maintaining its illegal stranglehold in Namibia, the Pretoria régime has transformed the Territory into a garrison State. It has massively deployed its armed forces to police the Territory and rule the Namibian people through intimidation, repression and terror. Countless Namibians engaged in their legitimate struggle for self-determination have been killed or condemned as terrorists and incarcerated. The occupation troops are not only attempting to suppress the struggle for liberation but have also extended their acts of aggression and destabilization into the neighbouring States. The remarks made by the representative of the racist régime of Pretoria during the current debate are a clear manifestation of the thoroughly obnoxious idea of Africa being the white man's burden. What right has that régime to speak about the growth and development of the region, when it itself has grossly violated all civilized norms and behaviour and vitiated the regional atmosphere, thus seriously jeopardizing international peace and security?

55. We pay tribute to the leaders of the front-line States who, in the face of such unprovoked aggression and continued hostilities, have displayed the utmost restraint and statesmanship. We commend the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, for extending its full co-operation in the implementation of the United Nations plan. They have shown maximum

flexibility and have repeatedly indicated their preparedness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to accept a target date for the arrival of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), which would set in motion the electoral process under United Nations supervision. President Sam Nujoma, even at this current debate, has once again demonstrated readiness to co-operate with all serious efforts aimed at a negotiated settlement. We congratulate him for his far-sightedness, wisdom and statesmanship.

56. Bangladesh firmly believes that the Pretoria régime must be isolated effectively, and since our independence we have maintained no relations whatsoever with the racist régime in any field. We have consistently supported the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. During its membership in the Council, Bangladesh made every possible effort to ensure strict and effective enforcement of the arms embargo against South Africa as called for in resolution 418 (1977).

57. It is a matter of pride for Bangladesh to be able to make a contribution to promote the cause of Namibia. We attach particular importance to our membership in the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we will continue to take an active part in all its deliberations and activities. We had the privilege of representing the Council in various international meetings and symposia, as well as on its missions of consultation. Within our modest means we have contributed to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and have offered training facilities in Bangladesh for Namibian students. Bangladesh deeply values the trust and confidence reposed in it by the international community for assisting and facilitating the work of the United Nations Special Representative in the context of UNTAG.

58. May I take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for his untiring and devoted efforts to achieve the early independence of Namibia. We would again assure him of our continued support and whole-hearted co-operation.

59. We would also compliment the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Chairman of the Special Commitee against *Apartheid*, the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their valuable contributions in promoting the cause of Namibian independence, and we renew our plege to extend all possible co-operation to them.

60. The question of Namibia is one of the most poignant examples of the saddest chapters of modern history. The Territory has been a unique responsibility of the United Nations for the last two decades, and we cannot accept any formula outside the framework of the United Nations. On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we must redouble our collective efforts to free the Namibian people from the yoke of colonialism.

61. The Pretoria régime must be made to understand that it cannot get away any longer with violations of resolutions adopted by the United Nations. The Security Council obviously has a special responsibility in this regard. In the past it reviewed the situation from time to time but did not take a firm and decisive course of action. This has only encouraged the Pretoria régime to intensify its repression and brutality in Namibia. The time has now come for the Council to proceed urgently, with all the authority at its command and all the resources at its disposal, to secure the speedy implementation of its own resolutions and decisions. The United Nations plan for Namibia, as endorsed in resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is the only basis for a final and lasting settlement of the Namibian question, and we seek nothing more than its full, unconditional and expeditious implementation.

62. I should like to recall here that the Secretary-General, in pursuance of resolution 532 (1983), adopted nearly two years ago, undertook consultations with the parties directly concerned and, in his earlier reports, confirmed that all outstanding issues relevant to resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved except for the choice of electoral system. In his latest report to the Council [*S/17242*] the Secretary-General has confirmed this position and has pointed out again that, due to South Africa's insistence on a totally irrelevant and extraneous issue, it has not yet been possible for him to launch the United Nations plan. On the question of the electoral system, the leadership of SWAPO has shown flexibility and understanding, while the Pretoria régime has not even communicated its views to the Secretary-General. My delegation is in full agreement with the concluding remarks of the Secretary-General, when in paragraph 48, he urged all concerned to "make a renewed and determined effort to expedite implementation of resolution 435 (1978) so that the people of Namibia can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence without further delay". Under the present circumstances, my delegation strongly feels that the Council should reaffirm its commitment to the United Nations plan and mandate the Secretary-General to undertake further consultations with the parties directly involved, with a view to finalizing the electoral system for holding elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control, as called for by resolution 435 (1978). The racist régime should be told in clear and categorical terms to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General and that any further attempt on its part to obstruct implementation of the United Nations plan would compel the Council to consider imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against it, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Council should remain actively seized of the matter so that it can meet, at short notice, to take appropriate steps in the event of continued obstruction by the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria.

63. In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that human dignity is the victim in Namibia. The abhorrent practice of *apartheid* is contrary not only to the values of contemporary civilization but also to the tenets of all scriptures and religions. Therefore, those who sustain and tolerate, directly or indirectly, the continuance of the policy of *apartheid* are casting an indelible blemish on the history of

their own civilization and transgressing the laws of their own scriptures. I would urge those Governments to leap beyond oblique intellectualizing and to understand that what is at stake is a moral issue. In these days when mankind can quite justifiably take pride in its achievements in various fields, there is no room for such degradation of man by man. It is our earnest hope that the Council during its current debate will adopt without any further delay a firm and decisive course of action to bring about the dawn of Namibian independence. I pay tribute to the indomitable spirit of the oppressed people of Namibia, who have been waging their liberation struggle for 100 years. We are convinced that in the not-too-distant future this spirit will triumph.

64. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, Mr. Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

65. Mr. D'ESCOTO BROCKMANN (Nigeria) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Your decision, Sir, to preside personally over this historic series of meetings of the Council as it discusses once again the question of Namibia reflects the high priority Trinidad and Tobago assigns to the delicate and urgent matter of the total independence of Namibia. As a Caribbean country that is part of the great Latin American family, Trinidad and Tobago embodies the practice of non-aligned principles. If we add to that State policy your skills and personal experience, we cannot but expect that the work of the Council will lead to substantive decisions that will benefit the Namibian people. The Nicaraguan delegation is pleased to reiterate its complete co-operation with you.

66. May I also greet my colleagues whose presence in this debate demonstrates the importance that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries attaches to this issue.

67. Nicaragua is participating in this debate for two reasons. First of all, we are complying with agreements set forth in the plan of action [*see S/17184, annex*] adopted at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985. Secondly, our participation reflects the fact that our people and Government are completely at one with and committed to the fraternal people of Namibia and with SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of that people, in their struggle for the complete liberation of Namibia.

68. We understand, identify with and are in complete support of the people of Namibia, with whose unassailable vanguard, SWAPO, we share the experience of having emerged from a hard and bloody national-liberation struggle carried out against the military in power imposed by a common enemy, be it called Botha or Somoza. We share with the people of Namibia the same ideals, the same thirst for justice and the same yearning for peace. We look forward to that day in the near future when we shall greet the members of SWAPO in the seat that belongs to the completely independent State of Namibia in this great concert of nations.

69. The year 1985 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of SWAPO. We should commemorate both historical events with a serious assessment of what has been accomplished for the Namibian people during these years, in order to give renewed relevance to the principles of the Organization and to accelerate the process that will lead to Namibia's complete independence.

70. We also celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of fascism in Europe, after a struggle intended to benefit the entire world. Obviously, the hateful image of fascism has not been completely erased. The disgraceful *apartheid* régime in South Africa represents those very practices of which the people of Namibia and the true people of South Africa are victims. It is ironic that that régime should receive the support of some of those who claim the honour of having contributed to the final defeat of fascism 40 years ago.

71. After almost 100 years of colonial occupation, Namibia must not remain a festering colonial wound in a continent such as Africa, which has charted its course towards freedom. Non-compliance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions by a small number of countries—South Africa and its allies—and the opportunism of some foreign investors should not make it possible to continue to mock with impunity the Charter of the United Nations and the principles and norms of its system of international law.

72. On 18 April last, the racist South African régime established an "interim government" in order to ensure that Namibia would continue to be dependent on and controlled by that régime. That attempt to mock the will of the Namibian people and the support of the international community for its struggle and that of its vanguard, SWAPO, for the total independence of that people demonstrates once again that South Africa is not willing to end the subjugation of Namibia. In fact what the South African régime fears is that if the Namibian people were given the opportunity freely to express themselves on their choice of leaders they would choose SWAPO—something that would permanently eradicate *apartheid* and colonialism from Namibia.

73. As occurs in neo-colonialist systems, the unilateral measures promoted by South Africa in Namibia have as their aim strengthening and institutionalizing the hateful régime of *apartheid*. These attempts and their real objectives cannot but lead the international community to the unavoidable conclusion that the so-called interim government and the much vaunted constructive engagement are no more than delaying tactics to continue to deny the rights of the Namibian people and to convert the international community into an accomplice of the goals of the racist régime of Pretoria and its allies. The Council should emphatically, clearly and firmly condemn those hypocritical attempts by those who uphold *apartheid* within and outside South Africa.

74. These facts and the new military offensive, which has been described as an "iron fist" policy, embarked upon by South Africa in northern Namibia and the massive South African military mobilizations in southern Angola—a Territory illegally occupied by South Africa—are factors that promote a permanently unstable situation in the region and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. Those responsible for such a situation are South Africa, its allies and the upholders of that régime, in particular the United States. They are bent on putting into practice in the region the same mechanisms for destabilization and insecurity that imperialism uses in other regions to keep third-world countries under its dependence and control.

75. The similarities between the situations in southern Africa and Central America are undeniable. In both regions imperialism attempts to prevent self-determination and the emergence and stability of independent non-aligned countries. For this purpose it militarizes neighbouring States whose territories are used to create, finance, arm and lead bands of local traitors and reactionary elements which from those sanctuaries assassinate the civilian population, destroy economic infrastructures, mine ports, promote incidents such as that in Cabinda, and carry out terrorist actions under the pretext of creating "*cordons sanitaires*" to protect what the imperialists call their vital interests, but the sole purpose of which is to topple popular governments—even if these have arisen out of electoral processes of irreproachable integrity.

76. The Namibian people and those of the front-line States know who their real enemies are and the strength of those enemies. The establishment of so-called democratic internationals fools no one. They are composed of the same traitors and supported by the same common enemy. As our brother Sam Nujoma has said: "They have thus become part of the problem which will be eliminated; it is just a matter of time. When that comes about, these traitors will be cast into oblivion together with their mentors" [*2583rd meeting, para. 161*].

77. In a just and appropriate response, the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries recently held an extraordinary ministerial meeting at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April to consider this situation. Nicaragua endorses each and every one of the points contained in the Final Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at that meeting [*see S/17184, annex*]. My presence before the Council at a particularly difficult time for my country demonstrates the special importance that Nicaragua attaches to these meetings, which are a fundamental part of that Programme of Action. We hope that the Council will now take definitive decisions that can deal effectively with the question of Namibia's total independence.

78. Nicaragua has always considered that the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, has an inescapable responsibility towards Namibia. Resolution 435 (1978), aimed at implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, is in Nicaragua's view the sole basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem.

79. The members of the Council—particularly its Western permanent members that continue to support the Pretoria régime—have the grave responsibility to take effective measures so that the plan contained in that resolution can be effectively and immediately implemented without modifications or pre-conditions. Nicaragua has always considered that the Council should apply the measures contained in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure compliance with its mandate, and it urges the Council members to so decide at this time.

80. The United States Government must be requested to cease its misnamed policy of "constructive engagement". We must also insist—and Nicaragua with the full weight of its moral authority so insists—that the United States stop resorting to its veto power in the Council, since its sole purpose is to defend crime and mock General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the decisions of the International Court of Justice that have declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal. Although on this occasion I have not come here to talk about Nicaragua, it is impossible for me not to mention how similar the imperialist behaviour against the Nicaraguan and other Central American peoples is to the imperialist practices and policies in southern Africa. Only by rectifying these policies, which have no support from the international community or the people of the United States, will the United States Government acquire the moral authority to participate in the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the Organization. Until Namibia is free, independent and non-aligned, a doubtful light will be cast on the very foundations, purposes and objectives of the Organization.

81. Some Western United States allies, which have in the past in one way or another practised similar policies towards South Africa, have equal responsibility. The intransigence, the rejection of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the arrogance and the obvious manoeuvres of the South African Government are the result of the consistent and persistent criminal support the current United States Administration extends to the abominable Pretoria régime.

82. It should be recalled that it was the current United States Administration which, after some progress had been made in the talks on granting independence to Namibia, invented for the benefit of South Africa the pretext of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and demanded their withdrawal as a pre-condition for granting independence to the Namibian nation. The international community has rejected this link as being totally improper and false. Only Pretoria and its allies in Washington continue to cling to that approach.

83. That is in direct contrast with the truly constructive and flexible policy of SWAPO, which is directed towards a peaceful solution, and also with the political platform presented to the Secretary-General by the President of Angola. Both have received the firm support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the international community as a whole. They have also unamasked the pretexts used by the Reagan Administration and South Africa in

order to continue the colonial domination of Namibia, or to attempt to replace it with a sham independence.

84. May I extend a warm and fraternal greeting of solidarity to comrade Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and its unquestionable vanguard in their struggle. After 25 years of unwavering struggle by SWAPO for a free and independent homeland, the people and the Revolutionary Government of Nicaragua wish to extend to the struggling Namibian people, to the leadership and the militants of SWAPO, and to its People's Liberation Army, a special message of encouragement and hope. I ask Mr. Nujoma to convey to the Namibian people our humble tribute to the brothers who have fallen in the struggle; their lives were not sacrificed in vain. Namibia shall be free one day. We extend our hand to comrade Nujoma as a reaffirmation of our irrevocable commitment to his cause: speeding the achievement of complete independence for Namibia.

85. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola, Mr. Afonso Van-Dunem. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. VAN-DUNEM (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour and privilege for me to have the opportunity to address the Council and to extend, on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola and its President, Mr. José Eduardo dos Santos, our cordial greetings to all those in this chamber, who have been convened at the request of the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to consider the situation prevailing in southern Africa, where the most heinous régime, the racist *apartheid* régime, is posing a serious threat to international peace and security by keeping millions of blacks under the yoke of total humiliation and oppression and by illegally occupying by force of arms the international Territory of Namibia, from which it is carrying out attacks against sovereign and independent States of the area.

87. Sir, we are happy to see presiding over the Council the representative of a country with which Angola maintains friendly relations. Your distinguished diplomatic qualities and vast experience will, we are sure, bring to the work of this series of meetings all the seriousness and level-headedness called for by the situation in southern Africa, where a drive by the criminal *apartheid* régime to destabilize and overthrow the Governments of neighbouring States has assumed alarming and sinister proportions, in spite of the many resolutions of condemnation adopted by the international community, including the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity.

88. We wish also to convey once more to the Secretary-General our warm appreciation and gratitude for his praiseworthy and tireless efforts since his election to the leadership of the United Nations to bring about peaceful settlements of the international problems facing the Organization.

89. The present international situation is marked by numerous sources of tension throughout the world. In that context, the situation in southern Africa—although some claim to detect a certain improvement—has been deteriorating dangerously of late, not only for the South African and Namibian peoples, but also for the peoples of other countries which have suffered the terrible horrors and effects of the war waged by the racist régime of South Africa, as well as for mankind at large, for the persistence of *apartheid*, with all its consequences and the actions undertaken to strengthen it, could cause the present conflict and tension to result in unforeseeable consequences.

90. Indeed, the *apartheid* régime, the illegal occupation of Namibia and acts of aggression by the racist régime against other States of the region are at the core of the question of southern Africa. It is perfectly clear that the restoration of peace to the area requires the independence of Namibia and the elimination of the South African racist régime. In our view, therefore, the situation in southern Africa should be the object of the very closest attention during the current series of meetings, so that the Council may find the most effective means and the most just solutions for the settlement of the problems of the region, in accordance with the numerous resolutions already adopted by the Organization, particularly Council resolution 435 (1978).

91. But seven years after its adoption that resolution still remains unimplemented, in spite of its binding nature. This situation is a result not only of the intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa, but also of the collusion of certain Western Powers which have pursued policies of connivance and alliance with the *apartheid* régime. Those policies include the linkage conceived by the United States Administration with the sole aim of delaying or even preventing the full and effective implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

92. Resolution 435 (1978) contains the legal and political basis for the solution of the problem of Namibian independence, and was adopted unanimously. It should be recalled that, in conformity with Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, Members of the United Nations are obliged in good faith to discharge their obligations under the Charter. That means that full implementation of the resolution in question is part of the responsibility of all States. In that context it is unacceptable to put forward elements extraneous to that resolution and thus categorically rejected by the entire international community.

93. That is why, by its resolution 539 (1983), the Council rejected all South African attempts to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous matters such as the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban internationalist forces, whose presence is fully in keeping with Article 51 of the Charter and falls within the exclusive sovereign competence of Angola.

94. The traditional arrogance of the racist South African Government, which refuses to abide by United Nations resolutions, is unquestionably being encouraged by the policy of the United States regarding southern Africa. The

most recent manifestation of that policy is the notion of constructive engagement, aimed only at uninterrupted exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia by foreign economic interests, in defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,[1] and at strengthening the aggressive military machine of the Pretoria régime by encouraging it to maintain its occupation of Namibia and to continue its acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring States.

95. Despite South Africa's persistent and increasing use of force and the threat of force in the undeclared war it has been waging against Angola for more than 10 years, Angola, loyal to its principles and scrupulously respectful of the Charter, has given eloquent proof of its political and diplomatic flexibility and goodwill by making a positive contribution to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in southern Africa.

96. Angola, in order to guarantee the speedy independence of the Namibian people, has put forward a platform for very realistic comprehensive negotiations to break the deadlock on the problem of Namibia. It has proposed a programme for reducing the number of Cuban troops on our territory, the main features of which are: first, completion of the withdrawal of South African forces from the territory of Angola and control of its borders by the armed forces of Angola; secondly, a solemn declaration by South Africa commiting it to ensuring implementation of resolution 435 (1978); thirdly, a cease-fire agreement between the Republic of South Africa and SWAPO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people; and fourthly, the signing, under Council auspices, of an international agreement between the Governments of Angola, South Africa and Cuba and a representative of SWAPO, which would define the obligations assumed by each of the parties to assure the independence of Namibia and the guarantees necessary to preserve the security and territorial integrity of Angola. Meeting those requirements would be a major step towards the exercise by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to independence and towards the establishment of peace in the region.

97. However, despite the efforts and good will of Angola and other front-line States, South Africa's attitude continues to be very hostile towards the international community. That attitude is made possible by the complicity and support it enjoys from certain Western Powers, which should be held directly responsible for the difficult situation in southern Africa and for the policy of State terrorism pursued by the racist régime of South Africa against neighbouring States.

98. The lack of sincerity of the racist régime of Pretoria regarding the search for a genuine solution and for peace in the region is increasingly manifest.

99. But while the Angolan Government has been showing its traditional good will, negotiating with the South African Government on the holding of a meeting at the ministerial level, Pretoria's aggressive military machine has, since January 1985, under the direction of Major-General Liebenberg, Commander of Special Forces, been planning Operation Argon, aimed at destroying the Malongo oil complex in Cabinda province. They thought that in that way they would force the legitimate Government of Angola to submit to their will and to the will of the puppet gangs of UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola), to whom the operation would be attributed if it were successful. To carry out this machiavellian operation and experienced group of Pretoria's special forces was chosen, one belonging to the 40th Regiment of the Special Forces of the SADF [South African Defence Force], which has its training camp at the Bay of Saldanha, in Cape Pronvince. This group of the South African Special Forces was commanded by Captain Winan Petrus du Toit, who was takenm prisoner by the Angolan Defence Forces. It should be pointed out that Captain Winan du Toit has a long record of terrorism and that he had already participated in November 1982 in the destruction of the bridge over the Giraul River, in the province of Namibia, and in 1983 and 1984 in the Cahama actions and in one of the attacks on Maputo, the capital of Mozambique. After completing training at the Bay of Saldanha, more than 2,000 kilometres from Cabinda, the South Africa terrorist group, consisting of nine men, embarked for Cabinda on 13 May on board the *Juin Zonde*, a vessel of Israeli manufacture, and landed on 20 May during the night. However, at 1700 hours on 21 May, while waiting until nightfall to carry out their sinister plan, the South Africa terrorist gang was discovered by a patrol of the Angolan People's Army, which killed two of the enemy and took the leader of the group prisoner.

100. Along with the abortive Argon operation, we have recently witnessed an escalation of South African aggression against Angola.

101. In March and April a South African cargo aircraft, Hercules C-130, in another violation of the airspace of Angola, penetrated into its territory as far as the provinces of North Lunda and Malange and on four occasions unloaded about 80 tons of military *matériel* for its ancillary force, the UNITA puppets. The Angolan Defence Forces have already captured about 40 tons of that *matériel* unloaded on 19 and 27 April in Malange Province.

102. Furthermore, after the abortive sabotage attempt, there has also been an increase in reconnaissance flights by the South African Air Force, which have penetrated more than 200 kilometres inside our territory. In that regard, reference must be made to the flights undertaken on 31 May by eight aircraft in the Cahama, Chibemba and Mulondo regions and on 4 June over Virei and Tombwa in the province of Namibia.

103. The *apartheid* régime, which is once again testing the patience of the international community, intends to install on 17 June a puppet government in Namibia on the basis of so-called elections to be held among so-called political parties which in fact represent no one in Namibia and are not recognized by the United Nations or the OAU.

104. Angola strongly condemns this attempt by South Africa to evade the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and to impose an internal settlement

within the framework of the so-called Multi-Party Conference.

105. Once again the Pretoria régime has shown that it does not have the slightest intention of abiding by the letter or the spirit of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia but, on the contrary, is seeking to perpetuate its domination, oppression and repression of the heroic people of Namibia.

106. That "government", which would be nothing but a colonial South African cabinet on Namibian territory, will not have international recognition, and consequently its actions will be null and void. Furthermore, it should be recalled that any solution for the Namibian problem will be valid only if it is adopted with the participation of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and if it is brought about within the framework laid down by the United Nations, since Namibia is an international Territory under the Mandate of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the lawful Administering Authority of the Territory until it achieves independence.

107. It was in that context that the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, considered that it would be useful for the Council to be convened so that it could fully discharge its responsibilities for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

108. These meetings of the Council present an exceptional opportunity for us to live up to our commitments to the ideals, purposes and principles of the Charter and our international responsibilities in this year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

109. Angola hopes that this time the Council will justify the confidence placed in it by the international community as the organ whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security and will demand the immediate implementation by South Africa of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. If South Africa persists in its attitude of arrogance, intransigence and obstructionism, the Security Council may envisage the adoption of appropriate measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, which provides an abundance of means of isolating and eliminating the odious system of *apartheid*.

110. The statement made on 10 June by the representative of South Africa in the Council constitutes in itself an affront to the conscience of mankind and a further act of defiance of the authority of the United Nations, where respect for the sovereignty of States and non-interference in the internal affairs of States are fundamental principles. The coarse language of that statement suggests to us that South Africa wishes to perpetuate its criminal policy of aggression and destabilization against Angola. That is why we have recently witnessed a recrudescence of daily violations of Angolan airspace. Within this context, and since Angola is not a South African bantustan, we reserve the right to reply in due course to the letter and the spirit of the statement made by the representative of South Africa.

111. The people of Angola won its independence through a heroic struggle conducted over a period of 14 years against the Portuguese colonial system and does not have any lessons to learn from the criminal *apartheid* régime, which is exploiting, oppressing and repressing 25 million blacks. We reject and condemn any attempt by South Africa to interfere in the internal affairs of Angola.

112. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

113. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey): Mr. President, may I first thank you and the members of the Council for the opportunity accorded to me to make a statement on Namibia.

114. I wish also to express to you, Sir, our warm congratulations upon the accession of Trinidad and Tobago to the presidency. Your presence here for these meetings is particularly significant and will enable the Council to benefit from your eminent qualities and experience during the discussion of one of the most important issues in which the United Nations is involved.

115. I avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to the representative of Thailand for the skill and tact he displayed in presiding over the Council in May, at a time when so many delicate issues had to be tackled.

116. I wish to reiterate on this occasion how much my Government appreciates the constant efforts of the Secretary-General to promote peaceful solutions to numerous intractable problems, and in particular to ensure the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We hope that conditions enabling the Secretary-General to continue his endeavours will emerge.

117. These Council meetings are taking place at a time when world public opinion has more than ever focused its attention on developments in southern Africa and is expecting firm international action which can at last persuade South Africa that it has to alter radically its policies with regard to Namibia and *apartheid*. If the Council can fulfil the expectation of world public opinion, it will not only contribute decisively to the solution of the current problems in southern Africa, but also provide proof that the United Nations, as it prepares to celebrate its fortieth anniversary, is capable of playing a fundamental role for peace, freedom and justice in the world.

118. The independence of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations since its inception. It is true that some other problems have also preoccupied the United Nations from the very beginning and still await solutions. But the Namibian problem has a unique characteristic. Since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate in 1966, Namibia has come under the

direct responsibility of the United Nations. The Organization therefore has a special commitment towards Namibia, a commitment that it has been unable to fulfil for 20 years.

119. On the other hand, there is no other problem for which the international community has unanimously approved terms for a settlement. Resolution 435 (1978) prepares the ground for the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Namibia through free elections under the auspices and supervision of the United Nations. The plan evolved by the Council, which has also been endorsed by South Africa, still continues to be the only acceptable legal and political basis for an equitable solution to the question of Namibia.

120. The problem that we face now is to implement the resolution of the Council, and in this field the South African Government has succeeded so far in its dilatory tactics and procrastination. Despite the efforts of the Council, the OAU, the Secretary-General and the contact group and the constructive spirit shown by SWAPO and the front-line States, South Africa has refused to abide by the letter and spirit of the Council resolution, injected extraneous issues into the negotiating process, which has to deal exclusively with the implementation of the United Nations plan, increased its military presence in Namibia, reinforced its hold over the Territory and undertaken to impose an internal settlement with the aim of creating a political structure subservient to Pretoria.

121. There is no doubt that South Africa's objective is to obstruct the demand for the implementation of the United Nations plan, to prevent SWAPO, which is recognized by the General Assembly as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, playing the role incumbent upon it in the process of self-determination and to confront the world with a *fait accompli*. To this end, the Government of South Africa is blatantly violating the decisions of the Council and proceeding with its decision to install a puppet administration in Windhoek on 17 June in the form of an interim government of the so-called Multi-Party Conference. South Africa's latest military actions in Angola show how much it is ready to defy the international community.

122. It was to review the situation in the light of those developments that the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Turkey is a member, met at Vienna in an Extraordinary Plenary Meeting from 3 June to 7 June. My Government subscribes to the main thrust of the Final Document [*S/17262, annex*] adopted at the end of the Meeting. If South Africa can get away with its latest tactics and *faits accomplis*, the prospects for a settlement of the Namibian problem, in conformity with the United Nations plan, could be jeopardized, perhaps irremediably. The Council should, in our view, react strongly. It is only through a judicious combination of a firm stand by the Security Council and effective international pressure on the Government of South Africa that resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented. As long as South Africa is allowed to continue its unilateral policies, southern Africa will be deprived of a just and durable peace, and this will lead to an exacerbation of tensions, with heavy consequences for the peoples of the area.

123. In considering the question of Namibia, the human dimension should not be overlooked. The Namibian people suffer not only from large-scale human rights violations but also from the militarization of its Territory, the squandering of its natural resources and the exploitation of its economy, to the exclusive benefit of South Africa. The brutal repression of the people of Namibia and South Africa will undoubtedly reach new heights if South Africa is not challenged in a resolute manner. The United Nations, with its specific responsibility, cannot remain indifferent to the plight of the people of Namibia.

124. The Council has in the past adopted sanctions against South Africa. However, the arms embargo initiated by the Council [*resolution 418 (1977)*] has been circumvented by South Africa, which has now become a net arms exporter. The need for stronger measures if South Africa persists in its intransigence, and for a greater political will to carry them out, is therefore obvious. It is our earnest hope that the Security Council can this time reach a consensus on an effective course of action, keep the developments regarding Namibia under constant review and press unequivocally for the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978). This is, we believe, both a challenge and an opportunity for the Council.

125. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

126. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): First let me say how grateful I am for this opportunity to address the Council.

127. It gives me special pleasure, Sir, that you should be presiding over this meeting on the question of Namibia.

128. Once again the Council is being convened to discuss the situation in Namibia. Over the years, this body has been the stage for difficult negotiations and for debates, at times decisive, at times very frustrating, but the independence of Namibia is certainly one of those items which have constantly defied our ability to fulfil the mandate and the expectations of the United Nations. The legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and its sole representative, SWAPO, are still to be attained.

129. The tactics the Pretoria régime uses to avoid implementation of resolution 435 (1978) are well known. They range from the alleged partiality of the United Nations in favour of SWAPO to the more recent notion of "linkage", which would connect Namibia's independence to unrelated and extraneous issues. These tactics are employed to protect an internal settlement in Namibia that is incompatible with the United Nations plan. Unilateral developments sponsored by South Africa in the Territory include the formation of the Turnhalle Alliance in 1975, the convening of a so-called National Assembly, followed by the Council of Ministers in 1980. Lacking legitimacy, these arrangements failed, but the strengthening of a non-representative and illegal administration in Windhoek has continued. The fact that all these actions were declared null and void by the United Nations brought about no change in the South African attitude.

130. Against the background of the constant violation of resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the international community was recently confronted by another move by Pretoria when it announced that it would establish an "interim mechanism for the internal administration of the Territory pending agreement on an internationally acceptable independence for Namibia". In making this decision the South African Government would be taking into account the suggestions of a multi-party conference purportedly representing the Namibian people but in effect acting under the general guidance of interests residing outside the Territory.

131. Two elements of the statement delivered by the South African Government inspired an immediate response. First, we were witnessing a new unilateral action taken by the illegal occupying Power. Secondly, Pretoria omitted reference to resolution 435 (1978), which it had already accepted in principle as the basis for Namibian independence. In a note issued on 3 May [*S/17151*] the President of the Council stated that the establishment of the so-called interim government was seen by members of the Council as a measure contrary to the expressed will of the international community and was declared null and void, like all other unilateral actions taken by the illegal administration in Namibia.

132. The Brazilian Government condemns the decision to establish such an interim government in the Territory and adds its voice to the statement by the Council that reaffirmed that resolution 435 (1978) remains the only acceptable basis for a peaceful solution and an internationally recognized settlement of the Namibian question.

133. We are dismayed, however, at the reply to the Council's statement made the next day by South Africa [*S/17152, annex*]. It tried to insinuate that it would not "act in a manner irreconcilable with the international settlement plan" as long as the present negotiations held "any real prospect of bringing about the genuine withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola". These references to the linkage theory further dim the prospects of effective implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the peaceful withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. It seems that violence against neighbouring States is a weapon reserved by Pretoria to defend its presence in Namibia and its illegal exploitation of natural resources while at the same time it attempts to preserve the system of *apartheid*. When the Angolan Government captured a South African military commando in its territory, that was proof that the strategy of provoking destabilization of southern Africa is still very much alive despite every effort and concession made by the front-line States in 1984 to promote a climate of trust and confidence in the region. In this connection the expansion of the *apartheid* rationale calls for renewed condemnation.

134. The Brazilian Government rejects any racial discrimination, especially the system of *apartheid*, as incompatible with the basic values of Brazilian society and irreconcilable with the most elementary principles of respect for human dignity. Military aggression by South African forces and the establishment of the so-called interim government are actions which endanger international peace and defy both international law and the Charter of the United Nations itself. Brazil also refuses to accept any policy based on economic and strategic interests that can only serve to postpone Namibian independence and the elimination of racist policies in South Africa.

135. In the case of Namibia, an ever-growing consensus is developing over the extent of the threat posed by the South African occupation of the Territory. No one would deny that most serious efforts have already been made by the international community in order to pave the way for a negotiated settlement for Namibian independence. In spite of this concerted action South Africa has stalled the independence process, undermining the credibility of the United Nations. Other parties concerned, on the other hand, have given repeated signs of flexibility. Indeed, only a short time ago SWAPO reaffirmed that it would be ready to negotiate a cease-fire, as long as it would be followed by free elections in accordance with the United Nations plan. Angola also made its contribution when it informed the Secretary-General of the steps taken

> "with the essential objective of guaranteeing the independence of Namibia through the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), of achieving the withdrawal of South African troops from the south of Angola, securing international guarantee for Angola's security, independence and territorial integrity, and contributing to the establishment of lasting peace in southern Africa" [*see S/16838*].

136. At this crucial stage we must place even greater responsibility on the shoulders of the Council, and in particular upon those members of the Council in a position to exert a more decisive influence. Further hesitation in adopting measures to press for the independence of Namibia could result in aggravation of the dispute and tensions in the region. Brazil has always been an unconditional supporter of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, as enshrined in the Charter. The provisions of the Charter are not only to be quoted but also to be applied. At a juncture at which the occupation of Namibia is threatening the prospects of lasting peace in southern Africa, we believe that the Council must take further action in support of Namibia's freedom and independence. Brazil reaffirms here that resolution 435 (1978) should be promptly implemented, that it is the primary responsibility of the United Nations to guide the independence process, and that we consider it unacceptable to portray the Namibian question as part of an East-West confrontation and to introduce extraneous rivalries in this context, for this casts a shadow over the 25 years of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the 40 years of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTE

[1] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), Vol. I, annex II.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—July 1994 1,025